Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 STATE 130422
ORIGIN EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 ACDA-07 SP-02 PM-04 SSO-00 DODE-00
INRE-00 USIE-00 CIAE-00 INR-07 L-03 NSAE-00 PA-01
SS-15 PRS-01 TRSE-00 IO-13 H-01 NSC-05 NSCE-00
/072 R

DRAFTED BY EUR/RPM:PBSWIERS-ACDA/ISP/REG:RSTRAND
APPROVED BY EUR/RPM:WTSHINN
ACDA/ISP/REG:MHUMPHREYS
EUR/CE:GMHUMPHREY (INFO)
OSD/ISA:TPHDUNLOP
S/P:PSKAPLAN
EUR/RPM:JJMARESCA
PM/DCA:PSCHOETTLE(INFO)
----------070116Z 090867 /75
O 070021Z JUN 77
FM SECSTATE WASHDC
TO USMISSION NATO IMMEDIATE

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 130422

HOLD FOR OPENING OF BUSINESS

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: CSCE, NATO

SUBJECT: CSCE/CBMS - JUNE 7 POLADS MEETING

REFS: A) USNATO 4651; B) USNATO 4566; C) USNATO
4666 AND 4674; D) USNATO 4565; E) USNATO 4055;
F) STATE 115392; G) STATE 91435

1. WE AGREE WITH USNATO THAT THE DRAFT PAPER ISD/147
(REFTEL B) IS A BALANCED AND COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF CBM
IMPLEMENTATION AND A USEFUL ROAD MAP FOR ALLIED PREPARA-
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 130422

TIONS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW IN BELGRADE. WE
ENDORSE PROPOSAL OF POLADS CHAIRMAN THAT PAPER SERVE AS
INTRODUCTORY PART OF LONG PAPER ON CBMS (ISD/141).

2. FOLLOWING ARE OUR SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON ISD/147:

A. SECTIONS II.A.(I) AND (II) ON MAJOR AND OTHER

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009

MANEUVERS. SUGGEST ADDITION OF SENTENCE ALONG FOLLOW LINES: "THE ALLIES SHOULD BE PREPARED TO DEAL WITH ANY EASTERN CLAIM THAT NATO MANEUEVER ACTIVITY IN EUROPE HAS INCREASED SINCE THE SIGNATURE OF THE FINAL ACY"

B. IF ALLIES AGREE TO COMMENT 2A ABOVE, WE WOULD FURTHER PROPOSE THAT A SIMILAR SENTENCE AND THE FOLLOWING BE ADDED TO THE REVISED ISD/141 THE IS IS NOW PREPARING (PARA ONE OF REFTEL E AND PARA. TWO OF REFTEL F): "THE ALLIES AGREE THAT SACEUR SHOULD BE ASKED TO PROVIDE THE NECESSARY FACTUAL DATA. THIS SHOULD INCLUDE INFORMATION ABOUT THE NUMBER OF ALLIED EXERCISES (BOTH NATIONAL AND JOINT NATO EXERCISES) HELD IN EUROPE SINCE THE SIGNATURE OF THE FINAL ACT AND THE TOTAL NUMBER OF TROOPS INVOLVED IN THESE EXERCISES, WITH COMPARATIVE FIGURES FOR COMPARABLE EARLIER PERIODS, AS WELL AS ANY OTHER STATISTICAL INFORMATION WHICH WOULD BE USEFUL IN REPLYING TO EASTERN CHARGES."

C. SECTION II.A.(III) ON EXCHANGE OF OBSERVERS. A THIRD PARAGRAPH ALONG THE FOLLOWING LINES MIGHT BE ADDED TO THIS SECTION: "THE EAST MAY SEEK TO CRITICIZE ALLIES FOR EXTENDING INVITATIONS TO CERTAIN EXERCISES ONLY TO OBSERVERS RESIDENT IN THE COUNTRY EXTENDING THE INVITATION. THEY SHOULD BE PREPARED TO DEAL WITH SUCH CRITICISM. THE EASTERN COUNTRIES HAVE CITED THIS POLICY AS AN EXCUSE FOR NOT ACCEPTING INVITATIONS TO CERTAIN ALLIED MANEUVERS." SINCE IT IS AN FRG POLICY AND INTEREST THAT IS AT ISSUE HERE, MISSION SHOULD CONSULT WITH FRG TO DECIDE WHETHER IT WOULD BE ADVISABLE FOR US TO PROPOSE SUCH LANGUAGE
CONFIDENTIAL

OR WHETHER THE GERMANS SHOULD DO SO.

D. SECTION II.A.(IV) ON MAJOR MOVEMENTS. ADD "REVIEW" BETWEEN "THEIR" AND "PRESENTATIONS" OF FIRST SENTENCE TO MAKE IT CLEAR THAT THIS SUGGESTION TO AVOID MENTIONING MOVEMENTS APPLIES ONLY TO THE ALLIED PRESENTATION ON REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION.

E. SECTION II.A.(VI) ON DISARMAMENT:

1) AS PRESENTLY DRAFTED, THIS SECTION IS NOT AS BALANCED AS THAT OF THE DISCUSSION ON DISARMAMENT IN C-M (77) 29 (FINAL). WE PROPOSE THAT THIS BE CORRECTED BY REPLACING THE FIRST TWO SENTENCES OF THIS SECTION WITH THE TEXT OF PARAGRAPH 56 OF C-M (77) 29 (FINAL); THIS COULD STAND AS A SEPARATE OPENING PARAGRAPH, AND THE REMAINDER OF THE SECTION, BEGINNING WITH THE SENTENCE "THERE ARE TO DATE..." COULD FORM A SECOND PARAGRAPH.

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009

2) DELETE "WELL-KNOWN PROPAGANDISTIC" FROM FOURTH SENTENCE OF THIS SECTION. POLEMICAL LANGUAGE IS UNNECESSARY IN A DOCUMENT OF THIS NATURE.

F. SECTION III ON IMPLEMENTATION.

1) FINAL TICK OF PARA 9. WE AGREE IT WOULD NOT BE CONSISTENT WITH ALLIED COMMITMENT TO FULL IMPLEMENTATION AND FINAL ACT TO DEMAND RECIPROCITY ON CBM IMPLEMENTATION. NOR WOULD IT BE EFFECTIVE MEANS OF GETTING EAST TO AGREE TO FULLER IMPLEMENTATION: WP STATES WOULD PROBABLY WELCOME LESS LIBERAL ALLIED IMPLEMENTATION, WHICH WOULD LEAVE THEIR OWN IMPLEMENTATION LESS VULNERABLE TO CRITICISM BY CONTRAST. ON OTHER HAND, WE MUST NOTE THAT WP COUNTRIES BOTH RECOGNIZE AND REGULARLY EMPLOY THE RECIPROCITY PRINCIPLE IN THEIR FOREIGN RELATIONS. IF NOT DROPPED, TICK SHOULD AT LEAST BE REVISED ALONG FOLLOWING LINES:
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

"--AN EXPRESSION OF ALLIED CONCERN THAT THE EAST HAS NOT RECIPROCATED LIBERAL ALLIED AND NNA CBM IMPLEMENTATION."

2) PARAGRAPH 10, LINE 2. FOR "NEW PROPOSALS IN THE FIELD OF CBMS" SUBSTITUTE PHRASE, "INITIATIVES TO DEVELOP AND ENLARGE THE CBM PROVISIONS OF THE FINAL ACT." IN ADDITION TO RESPONDING TO FRG (MEYER-LANDRUT AT RECENT US-FRG CSCE CONSULTATIONS) SUGGESTION THAT ALLIES GET AWAY FROM LANGUAGE WHICH COULD CONNOTE CHANGING FINAL ACT, THIS PHRASE WOULD ALSO TIE POSSIBLE ALLIED INITIATIVES TO THE POSSIBILITY OF STRENGTHENING CBMS ENVISAGED IN THE FINAL ACT (FINAL PARAGRAPH OF SECTION I OF THE SECURITY DOCUMENT) AND CORRECTLY CHARACTERIZE HOW THE ALLIES ARE ACTUALLY CONSIDERING THE VARIOUS POSSIBLE CBM INITIATIVES.

3) PARAGRAPH 11, THIRD TICK. BETWEEN WORDS "LARGER" AND "NUMBER" INSERT: "AND GEOGRAPHICALLY MORE DIVERSE."

3. WE CONCUR WITH MISSION COMMENT CONCERNING THE ADDITIONAL CBM IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW THEMES WHICH NORWEGIANS HAVE PROPOSED (PARA 2 OF REFTEL C).

4. WE CONCUR THAT MISSION SHOULD SUPPORT UK INITIATIVE TO BEGIN PRIORITIZING OF THE INITIATIVES FOR STRENGTHENING CBMS (PARAGRAPHS 3-4 OF REFTEL C). WE HAVE THE FOLLOWING POINTS TO MAKE, HOWEVER:

A. IN ORDER TO HELP ENSURE THAT THE ALLIED OBJECTIVE OF ADVANCING OR SUPPORTING A LIMITED NUMBER OF CBM STRENGTHENING INITIATIVES CAN BE MAINTAINED AT BELGRADE,

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009

WE BELIEVE THAT THE ALLIES SHOULD SEEK TO ORDER INITIA-
TIVES AS A GROUP AND NOT IN SEPARATE "ADVANCE" AND
SUPPORT" CATEGORIES AS THE UK PAPER SUGGESTS. SUCH AN
APPROACH WOULD MAKE IT CLEAR THAT THE ALLIES ARE NOT

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 05 STATE 130422

REPEAT NOT THINKING OF, FIRST, A LIMITED NUMBER OF
INITIATIVES TO ADVANCE AND, THEN, A LIMITED NUMBER TO
SUPPORT - WHERE WE COULD END UP WITH A RATHER LARGE
PLATTER AT BELGRADE - BUT RATHER REFLECT THE ALLIED
DECISION THAT THE TOTAL NUMBER OF CBM INITIATIVES IS TO
BE LIMITED.

B. CONCERNING THE DEFINITION OF AN INITIATIVE OR THE
CATEGORIES IN WHICH THEY SHOULD BE PLACED, MISSION SHOULD
CONTINUE TO USE THE GUIDANCE CONTAINED IN PARAGRAPH FIVE
OF REFTEL F. IF PRESSED BY ALLIES, MISSION MAY STATE THAT
OUR INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP ON CBMS IS MEETING AGAIN
SHORTLY AND IT IS EXPECTED THAT WE WILL BE IN A POSITION
TO COMMENT ON MOVEMENTS AT THE EARLIEST THEREAFTER.

5. UK COMMENTS AND FRG PAPER ON MANEUVERS (PARAS THREE
AND FIVE OF REFTEL C) ARE USEFUL CONTRIBUTIONS TO
DISCUSSION ON THE LANGUAGE OF THE INITIATIVES WHICH THE
ALLIES WILL ADVANCE OR SUPPORT. WE HAVE TWO SPECIFIC
REACTIONS TO THE FRG PAPER:

A. WE WOULD SUGGEST THAT IT WOULD BE PREMATURE TO START
ADDRESSING OR INCLUDING ACTUAL TEXTS OF INITIATIVES IN
ISD/141 BEFORE THE ALLIES HAVE COMPLETED THE ESTABLISH-
MENT OF PRIORITIES AMONG THEM WHICH THE UK PAPER (PARA
FOUR ABOVE) WOULD HELP GET UNDERWAY. WE COULD, HOWEVER,
AGREE TO SUCH INCLUSION IF IT WERE MADE CLEAR (ANALOGOUS
TO THE PROCEDURE FOR THE C-M(77)29(FINAL) ANNEX
(PARA 1A OF REFTEL G)) THAT SUCH TEXTS ARE ONLY
ILLUSTRATIVE.

B. IN THIS CONNECTION, WE NOTE THAT THE FRG FORMULATION
WOULD EXTEND NOTIFICATION OBLIGATION TO MANEUVERS INVOLVING
BETWEEN 10-25,000 TROOPS BY REFERENCE TO THE MAJOR MANEU-
VERS PROVISION OF THE FINAL ACT (SECOND TICK OF DRAFT
TEXT CONTAINED IN PARAGRAPH FIVE OF REFTEL C). WE BELIEVE
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 06 STATE 130422

IT IS IMPORTANT TO KEEP OPEN THE ALTERNATIVE FOR DEALING

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009

WITH THE 10-25,000 TROOP ISSUE THROUGH THE OTHER MANEUVERS PROVISION OF THE FINAL ACT. IF FRG TEXT IS INCLUDED IN ISD/141, WE BELIEVE IT WOULD BE USEFUL ALSO TO INCLUDE AN ILLUSTRATIVE TEXT WHICH WOULD ACHIEVE THE RESULT BY REFERENCE TO THE LATTER PROVISION - AS SUGGESTED BY THE UK. SUCH A TEXT MIGHT READ:

"THE REPRESENTATIVES DESIGNATED BY THE MINISTERS OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE CSCE PARTICIPATING STATES, REFERRING TO PROVISIONS OF THE FINAL ACT REGARDING NOTIFICATION OF SMALLER SCALE MILITARY MANEUVERS AND

-- "BELIEVING THAT THE NOTIFICATION OF SUCH MANEUVERS CONTRIBUTES TO STRENGTHENING CONFIDENCE AND INCREASING SECURITY AND STABILITY,

"HAVE AGREED THAT HENCEFORTH NOTIFICATION WILL BE GIVEN OF ALL MANEUVERS COMPRISING A TOTAL OF 10-25,000 MEN, AND CORRESPONDING IN OTHER RESPECTS TO THE PARAMETERS CONTAINED IN THE PROVISIONS ON THE PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MANEUVERS."

C. WE ALSO BELIEVE THAT THE TYING TOGETHER OF THE INITIATIVES CONCERNING THE SIZE OF MANEUVERS WITH THOSE CONCERNING THE TIME AND DETAIL OF NOTIFICATION NEEDS FURTHER DISCUSSION.

6. MISSION SHOULD RESERVE ITS POSITION CONCERNING THE FRG MOVEMENTS PROPOSAL (REFTEL D) AS INDICATED IN PARAGRAPH 4B ABOVE. IT WOULD BE HELPFUL TO US, HOWEVER, IF MISSION COULD ENQUIRE CONCERNING REASONING FOR FRG OPINION THAT ALLIES SHOULD SUPPORT, RATHER THAN ADVANCE, A MOVEMENTS CBM.

VANCE
CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01-Jan-1994 12:00:00 am
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: ALLIANCE, MISSILES, MILITARY CAPABILITIES, BRIEFING MATERIALS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Sent Date: 07-Jun-1977 12:00:00 am
Decaption Date: 01-Jan-1960 12:00:00 am
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 22 May 2009
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1977STATE130422
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: ACDA/ISP/REG:RSTRAND
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Expiration:
Film Number: D770201-0957
Format: TEL
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1977/newtext/t19770682/aaaacudz.tel
Line Count: 265
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Message ID: 988dbf83-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ORIGIN EUR
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 31-Mar-2005 12:00:00 am
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 2246918
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: CSCE/CBMS - JUNE 7 POLADS MEETING
TAGS: PFOR, MILI, CSCE, NATO
To: NATO BRUSSELS
Type: TE
vdkvgwkey: odbc://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/988dbf83-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
22 May 2009
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009